DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 043 CG 004 814

AUTHOR Moore, Marv; And Others
TITLE Married Student Outreach Programs Completed During the 1968-69 Academic Year at Colorado State University. Research Report No. 29.
INSTITUTION Colorado State Univ., Fort Collins. Univ. Counseling Center.
PUB DATE Aug 69
NOTE 40p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.10
DESCRIPTORS College Students, Communication (Thought Transfer), Marital Instability, *Marital Status, *Marriage, Relationship, Seminars, Social Life, Social Planning, *Social Recreation Programs, *Student Needs, *Student Personnel Services

ABSTRACT

In 1968 the Counseling Center at Colorado State University created a ten-week pilot seminar for normal married students. Couples explored their marriage relationship aiming to discover better ways of growing together. Later in 1968, some philosophical guidelines were proposed for working with married students on campus. With these two projects finished, three new projects were begun in 1969. The first was an interest-opinion survey, designed to find the answers to questions concerning types of programs married students preferred and the amount of support present in the married student housing community. The second project consisted of three student marriage seminars consisting of four couples each. The basic purpose of these seminars was to teach participants some concepts and exercises for improving their interpersonal communication. The third project was the setting up of an experimental social center. The social center was not totally a success; few people used it. However, it was open for a short time and its use was increasing when it closed. Recommendations for programs are given. (KJ)

ED035043

MARRIED STUDENT OUTREACH PROGRAMS COMPLETED DURING THE 1968-69 ACADEMIC YEAR AT COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

BY

Marv Moore, Coordinator of Counselor Training and Married Students Programs

Dave Forrest, Doctoral Intern

John Hinkle, Assistant Director for Counseling Services

All authors are members of the University Counseling Center faculty.

STUDENT SERVICES RESEARCH REPORTS: NUMBER 29

Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado
August, 1969

CG004814

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	1-3
II.	Project 1: Fall, 1968. The Interest-Opinion Survey	4-16
	A. Purpose of the Study	4
	B. Results of the Survey	4-12
	1. Demographic Data	4
	2. Attitudes about living conditions and physical facilities	5
	3. Attitudes towards social aspects of CSU married housing	7
	4. Locating formal and/or informal social structures within the married student community	9
	5. Desired social activities enumerated by respondents	12
	C. Discussion of Results	13
III.	Project 2: Spring, 1969. The Student Marriage Seminars	17-19
	A. The purpose of the Student Marriage Seminars	17
	B. The Content and Focus of the Seminars	18
	C. Evaluation of the Student Marriage Seminars	19
IV.	Project 3: Spring, 1969. An Experimental Social Center in CSU Married Student Housing	20-31
	A. Summary of the Original Proposal	20
	B. The Actual Project: One Experimental Social Center	21
	C. The Interview-Survey	24-31
	1. Purpose of the survey	24
	2. The interview sample	25
	3. Results of the survey	25
	4. Discussion of survey results	28
V.	Summary of Recommendations	32-33

INTRODUCTION

The 1968-69 Academic Year yielded several germinal projects for CSU Married Students. These projects were coordinated primarily by the Married Student Outreach Team (consisting of Marv Moore, John Hinkle, and Dave Forrest) in the University Counseling Center. Added financial support came from the Residence Education Budget, thanks to Denny Madson. Rex Kellums and his Housing Office staff helped us keep logistical and communication snafus at a minimum by their continual support.

In the spring of 1968, the Counseling Center showed its first initiative to create programs for married students beyond counseling for marital difficulties. The first project was a ten-week pilot seminar for normal married student couples, run by Marv and Joyce Moore. Six couples met weekly for two hours to explore their marriage relationship with the aim of discovering better ways to grow together. Some of the aspects of marriage that were pursued were: emotional giving and taking, the need for intimacy (sexual and non-sexual), child-like feelings and play, constructive marital fighting, non-verbal communication in marriage and the need for separateness. Although video feedback was experimented with as a communication facilitator between mates, most of the seminars were conducted as semi-structured sensitivity groups.

Participants' evaluative feedback about the seminars complemented by the leaders' impressions about the experience led to several recommendations for future marriage seminars. Recommended were the following:

1. That the video feedback process be used later (if at all) in the course of the seminars, after group members have developed more rapport with each other and are less threatened by honest mate-to-mate communication. Both leaders and participants felt that little was gained by the early use of the TV.

2. That the seminars be given more overriding structure, perhaps a theme and corresponding marital exercises for each week.
3. That the nonverbal communication workshop be kept in future marriage seminars. The majority of group members recalled the nonverbal workshop as a peak experience.

The second project in the spring of 1968 was a paper* completed by Marv Moore and John Hinkle. In that article, Moore and Hinkle accomplished two things: They reviewed the paucity of literature dealing with married students, and they proposed some philosophical guidelines for working with married students on university campuses. Quoting from their article:

Since the end of World War II, the number of married college students has constantly increased. In 1940, married students were relatively rare. Whereas in 1965, they accounted for between 17 and 24% of college and university populations. Assistance offered by the university to this rapidly expanding student group has been primarily that of a benevolent landlord. The good landlord provides comfortable, economical apartment dwellings with a modicum of extra facilities. A volleyball or horseshoe court for the husband, a laundry for the housewife, and a playground for the children typically comprise the university's offerings. Sometimes an experimental nursery, usually associated with the child development department, is also available. Consequently, the university, in its fatherly landlord role, has left the married student on his own to cultivate social and educational growth.

Relatively little attention has been paid to the student marriage relationship and how it is effected by the university experience. Occasionally, a social scientist conducts a survey and derives a descriptive characterization of what it is like to be simultaneously a student and a spouse. Counseling centers and campus psychiatrists deal with a small portion of married students undergoing unusual amounts of stress. Rare is the professional within the university who actually engages himself in helping the typical student spouse make his marriage more meaningful in conjunction with the academic experience.

In response to this professional deficit, the authors have recently developed a set of guidelines for a counseling center Outreach Program involving married students. The overall purpose in our work is the identification of major psycho-social and educational needs of the married student and the subsequent facilitation of a social environment that maximizes the attainment of such needs. More specifically our objectives include:

1. To study student marriages and define more clearly the psychological variables that constitute a growing, healthy relationship.

---

*Marv Moore and John Hinkle, A New Program for Married Students, currently submitted to The Journal of College Student Personnel.

2. To study norms and expectations in the prevailing married student culture and determine how this culture enhances or depresses mental health in student marriages.

3. To construct instruments that accurately assess psychological growth in student marriages, and instruments which measure the reciprocal interaction between the student couple and the married student culture.

4. To discover ways that married students may increasingly become their own growth facilitators, within both the marriage relationship and the larger married student culture.

5. To develop techniques for professional campus mental health workers which will allow them to serve as consultants to the psycho-social growth process in the married student community.

With the pilot student marriage seminar under our belts, and the creation of some philosophical guidelines to steer our course, we launched three major projects during the 1968-69 academic year.

PROJECT 1: FALL, 1968

THE INTEREST-OPINION SURVEY

In the Fall of 1968, the University Counseling Center and Housing Office of Colorado State University jointly surveyed all students residing in CSU Married Housing. The survey questionnaire, sent by mail, was semi-structured with both rating scales and open-ended questions. 47% of the family units sampled in two separate villages (186 out of 400 living units) returned this questionnaire.

Purpose of the Study

In the most general sense, the survey was designed to gather information that would help the UCC Married Student Outreach Team answer two questions: What kinds of programs do students residing in CSU Married Housing want and/or need, and how much support for such programs is present in the CSU married student community? More specifically, the survey served several functions: It provided some demographic data about CSU married students. It afforded student couples a formal opportunity to complain or compliment the University Housing Office about living conditions, facilities, and services. It attempted to locate formal and/or informal social structures within the married student community, and it asked couples what new activities they wanted initiated in their living units.

Results of the Survey

Demographic Data. The few questions on the survey designed to gather demographic data about the sample indicated the following: The mean length of marriage for all students sampled was 2.8 years. 42% of the respondents had children with the average being 1.6 children per family. These data indicate that the majority of children residing in CSU Married Housing are infants. The mean grade completed for husbands sampled was 15.3 years; for

wives, 13.8 years. This means that the typical CSU student husband has nearly completed his bachelor's degree while his wife is, on the average, one year less educated than himself. 26% of the husbands have completed more than a bachelor's degree; while only 3% of the wives have done likewise. At the time of this survey, 92.5% of the husbands responding carried 7 or more credits of course work. On the other hand, 77% of the wives carried no course credits at all, with 5% carrying less than 7 credits. The model length of residence in CSU Married Housing was six months or less for the respondents sampled.

From these data, a picture of the typical CSU married student begins to emerge. He is recently married and belongs to a rather temporary community of peers. More often than not, he has one or more children and is well educated, having nearly completed his undergraduate degree. And although his wife is almost well educated and has taken some university coursework, she tends not to be a student except for partial credit.

Attitudes about Living Conditions and Physical Facilities. Tables 1 through 3 present the content analyses of survey questions that allowed respondents to express their feelings about the living conditions and facilities.

Table 1. Content analysis of responses to survey question: Why did you move into CSU Married Housing? Table numbers represent the percentage and total of the sample choosing each category, and the top four ranks among the categories.

Percent	Total	Rank	Content Categories
39.0	130	1	1. Inexpensive: reasonable rent, good price, etc.
15.0	50	3	2. Easy availability: couldn't find another place, didn't know of anything else, knew more about it, could be arranged by mail, got married, etc.
26.4	88	2	3. Convenience: close to campus or campus facilities.
12.6	42	4	4. Good apartments: clean, comfortable, nice, furnished two rooms, etc.
3.0	10		5. Anticipated social life, meeting people, etc.
1.2	4		6. Good environment for children
1.8	6		7. Non-specific comment about environment, good conditions, nice atmosphere, etc.
.9	3		8. Non-scorable: a response that doesn't answer the question.

Table 2. Content analysis of responses to survey question: What physical facilities and/or services do you like best in CSU Married Housing as you currently experience it? The numbers at left represent the percentage and total of the sample choosing each content category, and the top four ranking categories.

Percent	Total	Rank	Content Categories
14.1	37	4	1. Laundry facilities: good, convenient, etc.
16.7	44	3	2. Maintenance/services: good, free, friendly, etc. includes comments on grounds maintenance, garbage collection and utilities paid
15.2	40	2	3. Apartment itself: general comments such as nice, new, spacious, compact, adequate place for machine
9.9	26		4. Apartment arrangements: separation of children, easy access, town house arrangement, etc.
12.5	33	5	5. Inside apartment: heating, bathroom heater, sound proof, two bedrooms, pantry, disposal, furnishings, etc.
11.4	30		6. Extra-apartment items: good storage space, good parking, playground, etc.
16.8	44	1	7. Convenience: close to school or shopping
34.1	9		8. Non-scorable: inappropriate or negative responses which should go in item 10 Again, for no response leave all columns blank.

Table 3. Content analysis of responses to survey question: What physical facilities and/or services do you dislike most about CSU Married Housing as you currently experience it? The numbers at left represent the percentage and total of the sample choosing each category, and the top four ranking categories.

Percent	Total	Rank	Content Categories
14.3	35	3	1. Services: slow, unreliable, noisy garbage trucks, mail delivery poor, etc.
7.3	19		2. Uncleanliness: trash area, laundry room, house when we moved in, grounds unkempt, etc.
7.3	18		3. Storage and parking: inadequate, too distant, unsatisfactory, noisy, etc.
12.2	31	4	4. Laundry facilities: inadequate, expensive, can't have dryers, closes early, little clothesline
2.2	6		5. Recreation facilities: inadequate, inconvenient, etc.
19.6	48	2	6. Construction and design: small rooms, crowded apartments, thin walls, color of paint, no clothes closet, etc.
12.2	30		7. Furnishings: too few, ugly, dirty; includes comments on rugs, bookcases (too many), drapes, etc.
73.3	57	1	8. Inside fixtures: bad wall paint, poor heat control, no overhead lights, no hot water, no shower, etc.
	1		9. Non-scorable or inappropriate responses

Tables 1 and 2 indicate that the majority of married students residing in university provided housing moved there and stay there because of the convenience. The apartments are easy to rent, reasonable, and close to the university and town. On the other hand residents complained (Table 3) of inadequate furnishings, poor design and construction problems, slow and unreliable attention from the Housing Office about requests and inadequate laundry facilities. So although residents do not consider their abodes as ideal, they typically feel that they get more space, services and convenience per dollar than in comparable non-university housing.

Attitudes Toward Social Aspects of CSU Married Housing. Tables 4 and 5 show the content analyses of responses to two open-ended questions concerning the social aspects of CSU Married Housing.

Table 4. Content analysis of responses to survey question: What social aspects do you like best about CSU Married Housing as you currently experience it? The numbers at left of the table represent the percentage and total of the sample choosing each category, and the top three ranking categories.

Percent	Total	Rank		Content Categories
2.6	3		1.	Commonalities: all have same problems (only)
2.6	3		2.	Commonalities: all have same incomes (only)
26.5	31	1	3.	Commonalities: general comments, including here interests and goals and age.
18.0	21	2	4.	Friendly neighbors: nice people, etc.
13.7	16	3	5.	Meet people: including meeting people from across the nation or around the world
2.6	3		6.	Privacy: able to do what I want, etc.
4.2	5		7.	Good for children
30.0	35		8.	Non-scorable, as above (include negative response)

Table 5. Content analysis of response to survey question: What do you dislike most about CSU Married Housing as you currently experience it? The numbers at left represent the percentage and total of the sample choosing each category, and the top four ranking categories.

Percent	Total	Rank	Content Categories
17.1	13	2	1. Lack of opportunity to meet people hard to meet, physical layout prevents contact, need more organized activities or recreation facilities for contact, etc.
13.2	10	4	2. Not enough privacy? neighbors too close, living in a fishbowl, snoopy people, etc.
9.2	7		3. Children a problem: parents don't control them, too noisy, etc.
15.8	12	3	4. Inconsiderate and irresponsible neighbors: noisy, untrustworthy, etc.
35.5	27	1	5. General negative remark: poor, none, etc.
6.6	5		6. Positive or neutral statement: great, no complaints, satisfied, too busy, etc.
2.6	2		7. Non-scorable or inappropriate responses

Table 6 presents the content analysis of another survey question designed to get at respondent's attitudes towards married housing.

Table 6. Content analysis of survey question: Are there any other aspects of CSU Married Housing that you would like to see changed or improved? The numbers at left represent percentage and total of sample choosing each content category, and the top five ranking categories.

Percent	Total	Rank	Content Categories
23.6	32	1	1. Response stating "no" or "none"
14.1	20	4	2. Request for changes in specific rules and regulations to obtain or allow stated things (except pets). Include here rent scale changes and mail delivery.
7.8	11		3. Allowance of pets.
17.6	25	2.5	4. Interior improvement: furnishings, fixtures, etc.
10.6	15	5	5. Improved laundry facilities: washers, dryers, clotheslines, cleanliness, etc.
17.6	25	2.5	6.. Outside facilities: sports, parking, garbage, sidewalks, grounds, etc.
4.9	7		7. Separation of children from childless couples: also better control of children.
3.5	5		8. Better protection for children: gates, fences, etc.
2.8	4		9. Promotion of better relations amongst tenants: courtesy, social organization.

The reader will first note back in Table 1 that the respondents, when asked why they moved into married housing gave a minimum of socially-oriented answers. Again, when asked what they would like to see changed (Table 6), the organization or creation of social activities was seldom mentioned. Apparently, the respondents did not move into university owned housing with a primary aim of meeting their social needs, nor do they perceive social change in their community as a goal after arriving there. When asked more directly about the social aspects of married student living, the respondents were willing to answer. The positive social aspects most commonly stated (Table 4) were a broad range of commonalities (interests, goals, age, problems), friendly neighbors, any chance to meet new and different persons. The negative social aspects (Table 5) mentioned most frequently were lack of opportunity to meet new persons, too few organized social activities, inconsiderate neighbors, and not enough privacy. Only 6.6% of the sample said that it had no negative remarks about the social aspects of its community. Although the majority of the sample does not view social needs as prime motivators for moving into the married housing community, portions of the sample will discuss at length the social changes and activities that ought to be remedied.

Locating Formal and/or Informal Social Structures within the Married Student Community. Several questions attempted to locate existing social structures within the married student community. To begin with, the sample was asked directly: Is there any kind of social organization (informal or formal) in your building (Question 11)? 85% answered "No"; 9.7% answered "Yes"; and 4.3% did not know. The 9.7% who responded "yes" failed to describe, as asked to do, the social organization in their building. Secondly, respondents were asked: Is there one or more persons in your building that typically take the role of "social leader or organizer" (Question 19)? 6.5% answered "yes";

another 7% answered "yes" and gave the name of the social leaders; and 86.5% answered "no" or failed to answer at all. Third, respondents were asked: Are there any rules or agreements, other than those issued by the Housing Office, among the members of your building or court (Question 15)? 92.3% replied "no"; 2.7% replied "yes". Fourth, three questions were asked respectively about the type, the frequency, and the participation in social activities. Tables 7, 8, and 9 record the results of these three questions.

Table 7. Content analysis and responses to survey question: What kind of social activities have already been created by the couples and families in your building or court? Numbers at left represent the percentage and total of the sample for each content category, and the top two category ranks.

Percent	Total	Rank	Content Categories
45.0	81	1	1. Stated "no" or "none" or "none that I know of"
26.7	48	2	2. Picnic, barbecue, pot luck, dinners, etc.
8.9	16		3. Bridge, cards, TV
6.7	12		4. Coffee gatherings or teas
6.1	11		5. Parties of all kinds
6.7	12		6. Sports: bowling, volleyball, etc.

Table 8. Responses to survey question: How frequently do such activities occur? Numbers represent the total and percentages of the sample giving each category.

	Totals	
	Number	Percent (T)
Often	14	7.5
Sometimes	27	14.9
Rarely	47	25.3
Never	53	28.5
Unanswered	45	24.2

Table 9. Response to survey question: How frequently have you participated in these activities? Response categories are listed in the center of Table 9 with total and percentages for husbands to the left, and wives to the right.

Husbands	Total	Percent		Total	Percent	Wives
	20	10.7	Often	20	10.7	
	22	11.8	Sometimes	28	15.1	
	21	11.3	Rarely	18	9.7	
	74	39.8	Never	69	37.1	
	49	26.4	Unanswered	51	27.5	

Finally, Table 10 presents three interrelated survey questions and the percentage of respondents for each possible response category. These three questions attempted to locate the predominant social context of the couples sampled.

Table 10. Percentages in each response category for three survey questions asking respondents where their best friends live.

Questions	Response Categories			
	within your building	in another building	outside of CSU Married	No Response
Think about the couple with whom you and your spouse are most friendly; where do they live? Check at right	19.9%	25.8%	51.1%	3.2%
Think of your husband's best friend; where does he live?	3.2%	16.7%	73.8%	4.3%
Think of your wife's best friend; where does she live?	10.8%	19.4%	66.1%	4.7%

Most of the sample couples were unaware of any social organization, semi-permanent social leaders, or informal rules or agreements among the residents in their particular courts. They were also generally unaware of any social activities in their neighborhoods (Table 7); those activities that respondents had most knowledge of were usually eating functions -- e.g., picnics and barbecues -- followed by cards, teas, parties, and athletic events. Such activities were rated as occurring rarely and as being little attended (Tables 8 and 9). Correspondingly, for those activities that respondents participated in, husbands and wives attended about equally (Table 9). This may mean that spouses usually attend activities together or that they happen to balance out each other in their separate activities. One might hypothesize that wives would attend more female, daytime activities; our data does not provide information to check on this.

Over half of the sampled couples' best friends live somewhere other than CSU Married Housing; for individual spouses, the percentages are even higher (See Table 10). These data soberly imply that most married students may maintain their most important personal relationships outside the community in which they live. Why, and the extent that is so demands further investigation, for any new program instituted in the CSU Married Student community must seriously contend with this finding.

Desired Social Activities Enumerated by Respondents. Two survey questions tapped three levels of commitment in relation to possible social activities (See Table 11). First, respondents checked from a given list of activities those they would like to see initiated; second, they rechecked the desired activities they would be willing to work on; and, third, they double-checked the desired activities they would be willing to actually organize in married housing.

Table 11. Three levels of commitment for activities listed in survey question 12, and the frequency of identified (signed) and unidentified (unsigned) respondents under each level of commitment. Totals represent the exact proportion of the entire sample that checked any given commitment level for each activity.

Activity	Levels of Commitment: Would like intiiated			Willing to Work on			Willing to Organize		
	Total	Signed	Unsigned	Total	Signed	Unsigned	Total	Signed	Unsigned
Baby sitting Cooperative	68 37%	35	33	18	11	7	9	7	2
Bridge Club	39 21%	19	20	8	5	3	12	7	5
Scouts	25 13%	12	13	9	6	3	3	1	2
Day Nursery	52 28%	26	26	15	9	6	6	4	2
Educational Group	37 20%	20	17	11	7	4	4	2	2
Volleyball	67 37%	26	41	16	4	12	10	6	4
Football	43 23%	16	27	11	2	9	7	5	2
League of Women Voters	10 5%	7	3	3	2	1	1	1	0
Other (mostly) recreational)	41 22%	24	17	10	6	4	8	7	1

A careful look at Table 11 yields that except for sports, a high proportion of couples who signed the questionnaire (43% of the sample identified themselves) indicated considerable interest in the listed activities. However, the majority of respondents were more willing to participate in activities than actually work on or organize them. Among specific activities, the baby-sitting cooperative and day nursery ideas received considerable support; this relates to the earlier stated fact that the majority of children in CSU Married Housing are infants. It is assumed that the bridge club and educational group categories are checked primarily by women, and the sports categories by men, although it must be noted that results are not sex differentiated. Volleyball, the sport that received the most support in Table 11, does exist in two or more courts already; but the survey does not separate those who already participate from those who would like to.

Discussion of the Results

The model student husband emerging from our sample is an upperclassman whose wife of two years standing has attended some college, but is currently working or taking care of one or two children. Most of the surveyed couples initially chose university married housing for reasons of economy or convenience; and after becoming rather temporary residents, they stated the things that they would like to see changed are not primarily social in nature, but complaints about physical facilities or university services. Furthermore, most of these couples do not participate in or create permanent social organizations within their immediate community. In fact, over half of all spouses questions, reported that their best friends live outside of CSU married housing.

At first glance it appears that we might be wise to leave the CSU married student to his own doing, and bestow our need to help on a more willing population; but there is another side to the complete picture. Although most of the couples sampled did not mention social needs as a prime factor influencing

their residency in CSU married housing, they were very willing to discuss the social deficits of their community when directly querried about them. And generally, when asked directly, they describe a minimum of opportunities for social-educative experiences; there seems to be no existing sense of community, no strong feeling of belonging to a common group of peers.

In summary, an accurate depiction of the student population residing in CSU married student housing includes three subgroups: A vocal minority saying loud and clear: "Leave us alone; we don't want or need any social organization;" A larger group of married students who don't care one way or the other; and A significant minority saying: "Yes, we'd appreciate your professional assistance." In this third group are approximately one-half of the sample responding to the Interest-Opinion Survey -- the respondents who stated that they would like to see <u>new</u> social activities initiated (educative and otherwise) in their courts, and that they would be willing to lend participant support. The reader should note that one half of the survey sample represents nearly one-fourth of the total resident CSU married student population.

Why then, is there a discrepancy between the initial low frequency of sought-after social needs and the tendency for a large minority of respondents to later comment freely about their social deficits when asked to do so? Maybe, social needs are simply taken for granted until physical and economic demands are met. The results of this survey may very well be another example of the following phenomenon: Few persons would stoutly dispute that when moving permanently to a new place that one needs to make new friends; but how many people do you know what would mention "the making of new friends" as a prime motivation for moving.

Perhaps, too, this survey has tapped a lack of social awareness or maturity in the married housing residents. Young couples may be uninformed about the part that they can play in developing social relations and a sense

of community. Or they may expect the university to attend to their social needs as an extension of its benevolent landlord role -- without their having to do anything themselves. Although, at least tentatively plausible, these inferences cannot be supported with objective data from this survey. The validity of these interpretations awaits further experimentation.

This survey has caused us to restate our general question, "How can we provide needed programs for married students?" with a more specific one, "How and what kinds of social-educative programs can we offer to that significant minority of married students who desire our professional services?" On the one hand, maybe we can be viewed as "people-helpers" who don't know when to discard their eternal optimism. On the other hand, we prefer (maybe myopically) to see ourselves as approaching the recipients of our services with a more realistic eye.

Finally then, what approach is implied by a "more realistic" look at the married student population? How then can we have a significant impact on those married students open to our offerings without offending the larger majority of uninterested couples? We suggest two specific alternatives.

Our first suggestion is to continue gathering more objective data about the many unanswered questions confronting us about the married students at Colorado State University: Why is there so little sense of community in the married housing compounds? What are the actual turnover rates for residents of married housing? How do these turnover rates compare with other similar universities? Why do couples leave university married housing anyway? What are they leaving? Where are they going? What expectations do new married students bring to university provided housing? How do these expectancies change over the period of occupancy? What are some of the major agents that effect such change? How many student wives actually work full or part-time? How do they feel about it? How does it effect their marriage relationship? How are married students

living in university housing similar and different from married students living off-campus? We have a lot of research to do yet.

Our second suggestion bespeaks the practitioner in us as much as the scientist. We propose that pilot programs be tried with receptive married students and carefully evaluated. The Student Marriage Seminars and the Married Housing Social Centers (both described below in considerable detail) are examples of two such experimental programs.

PROJECT 2: SPRING, 1969

THE STUDENT MARRIAGE SEMINARS

In the Spring of 1969 three student marriage seminars, consisting of four couples each, were conducted by two man teams from the University Counseling Center. Homer Bollinger and Cheryl Normington comprised one team, Dave Forrest and Frank Richardson, a second team, and Marv Moore and John Hinkle comprised the third team. Co-leaders met two hours weekly with their seminars for a total of six sessions. All seminar leaders met weekly for a one hour weekly training-supervision session. Participating couples were drawn from the entire student body; letters of invitation were sent door to door to all residents of CSU Married Housing and to all other married students via an ad in the Collegian.

The Purpose of the Student Marriage Seminars

Several important assumptions about the institution of marriage, assumptions amplified by the group leaders at the outset, underly the purpose of the student marriage seminars.

a. Marriage is a desirable state of affairs, but good marriages are made, not given by god or the heavens. Couples must continually work together to keep their relationship exciting.

b. An exciting, growing marriage relationship, a state of satisfying intimacy, is based on honest open communication between mates on almost all important issues.

c. Intimacy in marriage is a cyclical thing; there are times of closeness interspersed with times of psychological distance. Spontaneous honest communication is one way by which the cycle moves -- sometimes from closeness to distance, and back to closeness again.

d. Constructive marital fighting or sensible management of aggression, is one of the most important processes to be mastered in the area of honest communication. And marital fighting is like dancing; it has to be learned.

e. The meaningful expression of reciprocal affection (sexual as well as non-sexual) is equally important in maintaining the cyclical flow of intimacy.

Based on these assumptions, the primary purpose of the Student Marriage Seminar is to teach the participants some concepts and exercises for improving their interpersonal communication -- including techniques of constructive marital fighting, and expressions of affection.

The Content and Focus of the Seminars

Based on the recommendations made after the first pilot marriage seminar (mentioned earlier in this report on page 1 and 2), each session was a semi-structured workshop. Conceptual material was presented by the leaders around the weekly theme and exercises designed to implement the theme were practiced by participants for at least two-thirds of the weekly session. Although the leaders initially served as models and coached for the exercises, couples were subsequently encouraged to become their own interaction consultants. Homework was given after each session with the hope of heightening the effect of the just-practiced exercises and/or preparing the couple for the following seminar.

Listed below are the weekly themes for each of the six seminar sessions.

Session 1: Getting acquainted and an introduction to honest communication.

Session 2: Three sides of you in marriage: the parent, the adult, and the child; and giving good communication feedback.

Session 3: Separateness in marriage.

Session 4: Nonverbal communication in marriage.

Session 5: Intimacy in marriage: Nonsexual and sexual.

Session 6: Constructive marital fighting.

Obviously, only an outline sketch on marriage student seminars is presented herein. If the reader is professionally interested in a more detailed

presentation of the seminar process, he should contact any of the authors of this report. Available upon request are copies of the weekly homework assignments, the leader's seminar outline of conceptual presentations, as well as descriptions of corresponding exercises for participating couples.

Evaluation of the Student Marriage Seminars

Evaluation of three 1969 Student Marriage Seminars was conducted in two ways. First, each participant was asked to complete an open-ended questionnaire concerning the six meetings. Second, the leaders spent their last training-supervision session recalling and subjectively evaluating their experiences. No one session was unanimously applauded or criticized by either participants or co-leaders. However, several noteworthy recommendations resulted from these soft-headed evaluative data:

1. Student Marriage Seminars should definitely be continued in the future, as each spouse recalled having gained something worthwhile from almost all of the sessions.

2. That the seminars run for a longer period of time. i.e. 8 to 10 sessions instead of 6, in order to cover and practice more effectively the seminar themes, especially that of constructive marital fighting.

3. That the co-leaders be male and female pairs if possible to more closely approximate the marriage relationship in modelling the communication exercises.

4. That the homework be dropped as a regular seminar process and instead incorporated into the weekly training experiences.

5. Finally, that a more hard-headed experiemental evaluation be undertaken to (a) label the processes affected or changed by participation in such a seminar and (b) to measure the amount of change in these processes as compared to an appropriate control group.

PROJECT 3 - SPRING, 1969

AN EXPERIMENTAL SOCIAL CENTER

IN CSU MARRIED STUDENT HOUSING

In the Winter of 1968-69, the authors learned that future CSU development plans consider the construction of Social Centers in married student housing. This being the case, we suggested that a judicious approach might be to create several experimental Social Centers beforehand and evaluate their usefulness. Therefore, we proposed that two CSU married student apartments be appropriated for the duration of Spring Quarter, 1969 as an exploratory venture. We argued that if the Centers were found to contribute to the married students' social-ecuational experience, then we would possess concrete evidence in support of future construction of such units. If, however, the converse proved true, then we would have saved the university a significant sum of money. With financial assistance from the Office of Resident Education, we began the project in the Spring of 1969.

Summary of the Original Proposal

First, the authors assumed initial responsibility for soliciting student interest in the project. We began by contacting those couples who had already expressed interest in activities appropriate for a Social Center (via the Interest-Opinion Survey). We also sent a memo to all residents in CSU married housing outlining the Social Center Project, and announcing the kickoff meeting. At the organizational meeting, students were to be assigned to the Social Center nearest them, and to elect a committee to oversee the operation of their Center. The committee's functions were to see that each Center was properly cared for and to become the communication locus for generated activities. A log was to be kept for each Center indicating what activities occurred and how many persons participated.

After transferring the responsibility for operation of the Social Centers to the elected committee, the authors planned to assume the role of resource persons, although continuing to observe the ongoing project. We felt that this process of monitoring the Social Centers without meddling was especially important, since one attitude expressed by a sizable minority of respondents to the Interest-Opinion Survey was: "Don't try to organize our social activities; we don't want it." Recognition of this attitude led us to make it known to the Social Center participants that we would bestow our professional services only upon request.

Finally, full responsibility for evaluation of the project rested upon the author's shoulders. While the project was in progress, we would regularly check the suggestion boxes placed in each Social Center. Later, interviews and/or surveys were to be conducted to assess participants' satisfaction or dissatisfaction with facets of the project. This information was to be correlated with actual use frequencies in the Centers to arrive at recommendations concerning the continuance or future construction of Social Centers in CSU resident married housing. Those recommendations appear later in this report.

The Actual Project: One Experimental Social Center

When the project became an actuality in the Spring of 1969, our original expectations were not entirely realized. The CSU resident married student population consists of two geographically separate communities. Aggie Village is the older settlement of roughly 300 family units; University Village has been operating only one year and includes 150 family units. Our plan was to set up Social Centers in each community and compare the two. At the kickoff meeting only one couple from University Village attended. Consequently, we sent out another reminder to all University Village occupants, telephoned

several couples known to be interested, and prepared for a second meeting. Only two couples came to the second meeting! After twice experiencing such minimal support, we discarded our plans to open a Social Center in University Village.

The project fared considerably better in Aggie Village. Fourteen persons attended the organizational meeting and proceeded to elect a committee to oversee their Social Center. Enthusiasm was high and within a week this germinal group had distributed an announcement of the Social Center's Grand Opening. The announcement included rules governing the Center's operation, suggestions for getting the most use out of the Center, and invitations to four separate activities were: organizational meetings for a baby-sitting co-operative, a bridge club, and an intramural sports club; and an open-house party. The Aggie Village Social Center began to function during the the third week of Spring Quarter.

The hard work of this initial group of Aggie Village supporters was not immediately rewarded. Few people responded to their various invitations to participate; in fact, the four publicized activities held during the third week of Spring Quarter showed an average attendance of 7 persons each. The attempts to organize a bridge club and an intramural sports group failed; and the open house party attracted no new residents beyond the original Social Center planning group. The baby sitting coop group, the only exception of success during that beginning week that the Social Center functioned, bears special mention.

Twelve mothers attended the meeting on April 8, 1969, in the Social Center to discuss a possible baby sitting cooperative. From that gathering evolved a child care cooperative which functioned at least throughout Spring Quarter. However, the participating mothers decided against housing the Coop in the Aggie Village Social Center. Instead, they cared mutually for each other's children, one or two at a time, in their own apartments. The main reason for this decision was the temporary nature of the Social Center. Why, the mothers reasoned,

should they buy used cribs and toys for the Center when it would be closing seven weeks later? It is clear from the report of Coop mothers that they would willingly use, on a daytime basis, one or two rooms in a permanent Social Center for a cooperative nursery.

After that first discouraging week the handful of persons who had worked so hard and reaped so little, understandably diminished their efforts to keep the Center going. They distributed one final bulletin summarizing the Center's events to date, reiterated the procedures for using the Center, and left the Aggie Village residents to use the Social Center in whatever manner they desired. During the next couple of weeks almost no one visited the Social Center. The weekly meeting of a Student Marriage Seminar, some children's birthday parties, a tupperware party, and a three day rummage sale just about describe the full complement of events. From the fourth through the seventh weeks of operation the Social Center was used an average of 2-3 times a week, with a mean attendance of 8-10 persons per meeting.

The last three weeks of the Social Center's trial existence evidenced a marked increase in logged activities. During this terminal three week span of time the Center was visited 3-4 times a week with an average of 10-15 persons participating per meeting or event. Parties celebrating the passing of comprehensive exams or orals were popular, along with a toy party, more birthday parties, and just plain parties. Apparently, residents of Aggie Village were finding the Center helpful in meeting some of their social and recreational needs. Two weeks before the Social Center was closed we received a request to use it daily for the first eight weeks of the summer as a classroom for teaching English to wives of foreign students. Most of these wives resided in university married housing. Obviously, we were unable to grant the request.

In summary, the experimental Social Project was a combination of success and failure. On the failure tally sheet we must score the University Village

Social Center. Resident support was so minimal that a Center never evolved. On the success ledger we enter the Aggie Village Social Center. A group of interested occupants publicized the Center's availability and coordinated it's ongoing use. And although their initial efforts yielded lean returns, the Center gradually gained legitimacy in the community. Frequency of usage continued to increase until the Center closed at the end of Spring Quarter. One group, apparently unaware that the Center was only a temporary experiment, appropriately asked to reserve the facility for daily use during the first six weeks of the summer. Considering the fact that the project occurred during Spring Quarter, when many social and recreational activities move out-of-doors, the Aggie Village Social Center must be considered as supporting evidence for the feasibility of permanent Social Centers in University married housing.

During the terminal weeks of the project a small sample of residents was interviewed to assess their attitudes about the experimental Social Center as well as other pertinent items. The data provided by that survey are presented in the following section of this report.

The Interview-Survey

Purpose of the Survey. The purpose of the interview survey was threefold: (1) To collect some follow-up data indicating how residents felt about the experimental Social Center; it was assumed that the majority of interviewees would not have participated in the project; (2) To obtain a rough assessment of how much support there might be in the married student community for a permanent social center; and (3) To afford a situation more personal that a mailed questionnaire for respondents to air any other grievances or needs that they might wish to share with the Married Student Outreach Team.

The Sample. 43 families, 12 from University Village and 21 from Aggie Village were interviewed by four student wives, also residing in university housing. The sample split between the two separate communities is proportionate to the actual difference in their populations (Aggie = 300 units; University = 150 units). In four cases only the wife was interviewed, in all others both spouses were present. In 31 cases only the husband is a student; in 9, both mates are students; and in 3, only the wife is a student. 25 of the 43 couples sampled have children with an average of 1.76 children per family. The average length of residence in university housing for couples interviewed is 13 months. Finally, all persons in this sample had indicated earlier on the Interest-Opinion Survey that they were willing to be interviewed further about their experiences in university married housing.

Results of the Survey. Several interview questions attempted to discover respondents' attitudes about the experimental Social Center. A large majority of those students queried had heard at least something about the Social Center, 86% of the husbands and 91% of the wives; but only half of the men and two-thirds of the women actually knew that the Center existed throughout Spring Quarter. 70% of the couples who had heard anything about the Social Centers obtained their information from one or more of the mailed fliers announcing the project, but not from their neighbors or friends. More than 60% of the students interviewed stated that they would consider using the Social Center for a party too big for their own apartments. Over half of the husbands and two thirds of the wives knew where the Social Center was located, but only 15% of the males and 28% of the females actually used the Center one or more times.

When asked why they thought the Social Center was used so little, husbands and wives differed in their responses.

Table 1. Content analysis of responses for both spouses to the interview question: Why do you think that so few people have made use of the Social Center? Table numbers represent the percentage and total of the sample choosing each category.

Husbands		Content Categories	Wives	
Percent	Total		Percent	Total
27.91	12	1. Don't have enough time	23.26	10
4.65	2	2. Wrong quarter to start an experiment	13.95	6
11.63	5	3. Poor organization; either too much or too little	6.98	3
16.28	7	4. Ineffective communication. e.g. lack of publicity, publicity too impersonal, didn't hear enough about it.	27.91	12
20.93	9	5. Social groups within married housing already established.	13.95	6
18.71	8	6. No response	13.96	6

Table 1 shows the most frequent response for husbands was lack of time, followed by a remark to the effect that social groups are already established in the married student community, so why bother. The wive's most common response was that communication about the project was too insufficient or impersonal to stimulate their participation, followed by lack of extra time.

The Interview Survey yielded a significant amount of support for the establishment of permanent Social Centers in university married housing. Table 2 reports 86% of the female respondents to be strongly in favor of permanent Social Centers; 49% of the responding males feel likewise. Of those married students interviewed with children, 60% indicated that they would participate in a baby sitting cooperative if it were part of a permanent Social Center. Finally, of the two thirds of the sample returning to school next year, 28% of the husbands and 48% of the wives (23 persons) stated a willingness to "spend a small amount of time" assisting in the organization of a permanent Social Center.

Table 2. Responses to interview question: What is your reaction to the idea of providing one or more permanent Social Centers for married student residents?

Content Categories	Husbands	Wives
Strongly in favor	49%	86%
Neutral	37	12
Strongly against	14	2

Attitudes concerning the Suggestion Boxes constructed in the Aggie Village Social Center and University laundry room were essentially negative. At least half of all interviewed residents reported no knowledge of the Suggestion Boxes at all; and no one interviewed had actually deposited a suggestion in either box. When asked if they would ever use the Suggestion Box for a complaint or a constructive criticism, now they were aware of its existence, 65% of the males said "yes"; 75% of the females replied likewise. But informants answers to another question suggest that they may have been just being polite in saying they would use the Suggestion Box in the future. When queried, if you had a complaint about something in CSU married housing would you take it to someone, 90% of both spouses replied "yes". And of those persons who would register their complaints, roughly 85% would go directly to either the Housing or Maintenance office. Apparently, most residents prefer to deal face-to-face with the source of their irritations, rather than indirectly via an impersonal Suggestion Box.

Finally, informants were asked what they perceived as the most pressing needs for married students living in university housing, and what the university might do to meet these needs. The responses sound clearly like a loud echo to the data summarized earlier from the Interest-Opinion Survey. A perusal of Table 3 leads one to conclude once again, that most interviewees want the university to take care of or improve their physical facilities before assisting them in social matters.

Table 3. Content analysis of both spouses responses to the interview question: What do you see as the most pressing needs for residents of CSU married housing, and what can the university do about them? Table entries represent the percentages and totals of the entire sample for each content category.

Husbands		Content Categories	Wives	
Percents	Total		Percents	Total
4.6	2	1. Provide a social center	4.6	2
4.6	2	2. Provide an orientation program for non-residents	4.6	2
4.6	2	3. Stimulate more social activities	4.6	2
4.6	2	4. Consistently enforce rules (pets and parking)	2.3	1
30.2	13	5. Improve inside facilities	25.6	11
13.9	6	6. Improve outside facilities	20.9	9
2.3	1	7. Provide more child care or protection (fences, sandboxes, educational programs)	9.3	4
2.3	1	8. Improve housing office relations (better billing system, allow choice of furnished or unfurnished units, easier access to personnel)	6.9	3
13.9	6	9. No pressing mentioned	9.3	4
18.5	8	10. Non scorable or no responses	11.5	5

Discussion of the Results. The experimental Social Center Project was carried out to answer a very specific question: Is there enough participant support within the CSU married student community to merit the future construction of Social Centers. Our answer to this question is both yes and no. No! If we look only at the fact that the University Village Social Center never even opened its doors, for lack of resident interest. Yes! If we look at Aggie Village where, for one quarter, a group of interested occupants successfully publicized the Center's availability and coordinated its ongoing activities.

Let's look first at what happened in University Village. Why did our offering of a temporary Social Center elicit so little support from residents? The newness of University may be one contributing factor; the 150 apartments there had only been occupied for six months when the Social Center project was initiated. Maybe a sense of belonging to that community, with its informal

social-recreational commitments to other members, simply hasn't evolved yet. It is the authors' feeling that the physical layout of University Village may discourage the development of informal social-recreational ties. Few spacious expanses of well watered lawn, the hallmark of Aggie Village, are present between the buildings; yet each town house style apartment bespeaks a distinct air of privacy. Walking through University the author sensed an ambience of cramped isolation.

If this interpretation contains some measure of truth, then it can be argued that a Social Center (or some innovative program) is needed more in University than Aggie Village, to stimulate more social contacts between occupants. Maybe a Social Center needs to be designated in University Village, minimally organized and maximally publicized in as personal a way as possible, and left to take hold -- much as happened to the Aggie Village Social Center. We recommend that this be tried, along with concomittant attempts to find out more specifically and conclusively what the University Village residents' needs are.

Second, what did we learn from the operation of the Aggie Village Social Center. We can say with certainty that sufficient support exists for the future operation of one or more permanent Social Centers in CSU married housing. During the trial period that the Aggie Village Social Center existed, use frequencies increased continuously; one party even requested daily use of the Center after it had closed. Almost all of the 43 couples interviewed in the terminal stage of the project expressed a favorable stance towards the creation of a permanent Social Center. And 23 persons (19 in Aggie Village; 4 in University) backed up their interest with promises to help organize a permanent Social Center next year if it can be appropriated.

We also learned that women are most likely to be the organizers and users of a permanent Social Center. The success of the baby-sitting coop compared to

the failure of the men's intramural sports club is one example of this finding. Another example is the fact that the majority of activities held in the experimental Social Center were either female-oriented or female-directed. This discovery makes sense when we realize that the husband is usually the student, with his wife working and/or taking care of their children. The Aggie Village success demonstrates, for one thing, that a Social Center can be a useful factor in meeting the needs of student wives. Research still needs to be done to determine more explicitly the nature of students' wives' needs, so that our future consultations and programs with this group will be effective.

What about the student husbands? The results of this experimental project reveal that his participations in a Social Center are more limited but substantial. Husbands figured significantly in the founding of the Aggie Village Social Center, especially in preparing and organizing distribution of the kickoff announcements. Furthermore, of the 23 persons expressing a willingness to help with a permanent Social Center next year, 10 are student husbands. Husbands, we predict, will definitely be participants in any future Social Center, although they may be slower to commit themselves to activities, and have less free and available time.

In summary, we now know that enough participant support exists within the CSU married student community to sustain functioning of one or more future Social Centers; but how many Social Centers do we need? How many are projected in the future construction plans? The results of this pilot project suggest that the total number of Centers needed may be less than previously expected, unless the university is willing to build some Centers that will stand unused. The plain fact is that we don't know as yet the answer to a very important question: How broad a community area, how many actual families, can we expect one Social Center to effectively serve? The running of an experimental Social Center for the duration of only two months cannot possibly answer the above question.

Consequently, the authors of this report propose that funds be appropriated for two semi-permanent Social Centers (one each in Aggie and University Villages) to be monitored for a 12 months period of time beginning September or October of 1969. The actualization of this proposal would meet three distinct purposes: (1) It would provide a continuing social service for the residents of Aggie Village who have already demonstrated that they can adequately support such a facility; (2) It would provide a chance to stimulate needed social activities in University Village; and (3) It would provide the necessary data to more adequately answer the question, how many Social Centers do we actually need to construct for optimal effectiveness? In this final regard, the approximate sum of $2,500 need to fund this proposal might prove small, indeed, compared to the thousands saved in consequently scaling down the number of projected Social Centers to be later constructed.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

This concluding section contains a resumé , for convenience's sake, of all recommendations made in each earlier section of this report. These recommendations are summarized here because, in effect, they represent the directions and content of UCC Married Student Outreach programs for the coming 1969-70 academic year.

Project 1: Fall, 1968
The Interest-Opinion Survey

In the Fall of 1968 an Interest-Opinion Survey was conducted to assess what kinds of programs residents of CSU married housing want and/or need, and how much support for such programs is present within their community. It was found that a significant minority of residents welcome professional assistance in initiating social-educational activities. In order to maximize the impact on those married students desirous of our services, two things were recommended:

1. That we continue gathering more objective data about the still unanswered questions confronting us about CSU married students; several researchable questions were noted.
2. That we conduct pilot programs with receptive students based on our current knowledge of married student's needs, and carefully evaluate their effectiveness.

Project 2: Spring, 1969
The Student Marriage Seminars

The Student Marriage Seminars were described as a pilot program designed to teach married students some concrete ways of facilitating growth in their own marriage relationships, through better mate-to-mate communication. On the basis of the subjective evaluation of both the seminar leaders and participants, the

following recommendations were made:

1. That the Counseling Center continue to offer the Student Marriage Seminars to CSU married students in the near future.
2. That more objective experimental evaluation of future seminars be undertaken to (a) label the interpersonal processes effected by the seminar experience, and (b) to measure the amount of such change as compared to an appropriate control group.

Project 3: Spring, 1969
An Experimental Social Center
In CSU Married Student Housing

The Experimental Social Center, another pilot project with CSU married students, was conducted to find out if enough participant support exists within the married housing community to merit future construction of similar Social Centers. The results of this demonstration project, along with those of an Interview Survey conducted as part of the evaluation process, reveal that sufficient interest and support are present to sustain functioning of one or more future Social Centers. Consequently, it was recommended that funds be appropriated for two semi-permanent Social Centers (one each in Aggie and University Villages) to be monitored for a 12 month period beginning in the Fall of 1969.